

644 Histoire sociale / Social History

The essays are segregated into three parts: the first, “The Classical Age: Canadian Legal Thought in the Late Nineteenth Century,” contains six essays; the second, “The Challenge of Modernity: Canadian Legal Thought in the 1930s,” contains five; and the third, “Postwar Developments,” contains one (the previously mentioned “On the Road to Oz”). This structure repeats what I take to be the sins of the title: the editors presume a structure where none exists (indeed, the essays in part 2 were written before the essays in part 1 [p. 14]), and they state a claim that was not Risk’s. The first two are also idiosyncratic, though the editors may well have adopted “Classical Age” and “Modernity” in deference to Risk, who uses each term once (pp. 52, 311). The third part is really a gesture of acknowledgement to what may be Risk’s final word, and its appearance as an afterword would be more in keeping with the modesty of Risk’s tone and temper throughout his work.

The other matters — the absence of a bibliography of Risk’s work, of a list of works cited by him, and of an index, as well as the presence of any number of corruptions of the original texts — diminish the prospects of the collection’s achieving the editors’ goals, even more so perhaps than does their inflation of Risk’s claims and achievement. The absences are curious. Not only did the same editors think it important to include a bibliography in their earlier *festschrift*; in the introduction to the present volume, they make much both of the way Risk relied, and failed to rely, on sources (p. 4) and of the themes his works express (pp. 10–17). Curious, too, are the corruptions, given the editors’ emphasis, again in the introduction, that “the articles appear in their original form” (p. 4).

The editors’ goal in assembling this collection was a worthy one because Risk’s work, despite its self-confessed limitations, deserves to be honoured and to be read. However, with more care and less enthusiasm, the editors might have served these ends, and the cause of Canadian legal history, very much better.

F. C. DeCoste
University of Alberta

SNELL, K. D. M. — *Parish and Belonging: Community, Identity and Welfare in England and Wales, 1700–1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. 541.

“Belonging” is understood in this book as attachment to a particular locality or place. Opening with the observation that “Where do you come from?” is one of the most frequent conversation “ice-breakers” in the English language, the author concludes around 500 pages later that, for most people up to the twentieth century, this question would have provoked thoughts of the “face-to-face” community to be found in their own parish. In Keith Snell’s words, the parish of the past was “a proud self-administering neighbourhood of inter-connected interests” (p. 497) undermined since the latter years of the nineteenth century by a variety of factors such as the collapse of rural populations, the spread of suburbia, the impact of

de-industrialization, and the centralizing policies of successive governments. Our own self-conscious yearning for a sense of “community” (only today does the term warrant quotation marks to indicate its general absence in reality) is a consequence of the sheer rapidity of this transformation and the sense of loss it invokes.

The central claim of this book is that the parish remained a chief source of attachment well after it is often presumed to have been superseded. Far from parish identity disappearing with the administrative reforms of 1834, Snell finds evidence, from an impressive range of sources, for its survival right through the nineteenth century and even in the first half of the twentieth century. This is an impassioned and sometimes powerful argument that often engages, and occasionally exasperates, the reader. It is, however, an argument that might have been better served by a shorter and less discursive book. Of the nine chapters, three have been previously published (in *Social History*, *Economic History Review*, and *Past and Present*, no mean pedigree) and a further four are original to this volume, and all are wrapped with a wide-ranging and suggestive introductory chapter and a surprisingly brief conclusion.

Chapter 2 begins the book with what is termed “a culture of local xenophobia” (p. 31), or hostility to “foreigners,” meaning those not of this parish. This is an intriguing approach to the construction of identities in which local antagonisms and rivalries, which Snell surmises were strongest among the most economically marginal members of the parish, were the roots of an attachment to place that was stronger than that to class. As elsewhere in the book, the predominant focus is on the rural and cottage-industrial communities. This chapter is followed by “Settlement, Parochial Longing and Entitlement,” the first of three chapters about social welfare, which together constitute over half of the text. In this chapter, based on a detailed knowledge of a complex subject, Snell constructs a cultural/administrative history that is more positive about the laws of settlement than are most historians, or than contemporaries have been. He argues that a sense of belonging and of “home” were integral to the operation of settlement legislation, which has been too often treated only in its administrative and legal context. The parish-based law of settlement remained a key feature of welfare entitlement even after the demise of the poor law unions and the boards of guardians, disappearing only in 1948. Snell muses that nothing of “equivalent social significance” (p. 160) has emerged to replace it.

The durability of the parish as a locale of “belonging” is further exemplified in a previously published essay on marital endogamy in rural parishes, which reappears as chapter 4 of this book. This is followed by a mammoth chapter (of 132 pages) that could stand on its own as a long essay or indeed as a short book on the importance of welfare provision at the local level in the era of the New Poor Law. The wealth of knowledge and insight that flows into this chapter is impressive, and one would hope students of social welfare will be confronted with its detail, but, if they have read it elsewhere, they will not be surprised by the central thrust of its argument: that locally delivered parish-based domiciliary relief remained a mainstay of the Poor Law despite the reform of 1834. This argument serves further to support the book’s central thesis regarding the

continued role of the parish, in this case as a locus of welfare provision. The administrative concomitant of this role, the remarkable durability of the office of parish overseer, whose responsibilities actually expanded under the new Poor Law and whose post was not abolished until 1927, is the concern of chapter 6. Snell then moves on to direct our attention to the 4,000 or so new parishes created in the nineteenth century as clear evidence of the “vitality” of the parish. In a chapter more tightly written than the others, he offers a highly original analysis of gravestone evidence regarding a local sense of place. The number of stones mentioning people’s association with place increased during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, only to decline, along with the role of the parish itself, from the 1880s.

This book is full of long, sometimes very long, chapters. It is stimulating and informative. However, its self-conscious focus is rural England and rural southern England for the most part. There are nods to the comparability of the northern township to the rural parish, but this is predominantly a study of the parish in the society of lowland England. One hopes it will stimulate scholars to search for a comparable sense of belonging in the urban-industrial Midlands and North or indeed in the Welsh hills. It would be churlish to criticize Snell too much on this score, for he has written a memorable book. Perhaps, however, it could have been a different kind of book. Snell is the very epitome of an engaged historian: no coolly academic air of detachment for him. He nails his colours to the mast: his preferences are for “the local, the immediate, the everyday, the face-to-face, the intimately known.” He states, “I have yet to believe that the ... global parish, with its colossal gossip networks ... can supply anything more remotely commensurate in environmental or human terms with what we are losing” (p. 27). This plea for a return to “community” could have reached a broader audience in a shorter, more sharply focused study. Despite this caveat, this book must be on the shelf of every respectable academic library, and it is one every serious student of social history should read.

Alan Kidd

Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

STONECHILD, Blair — *The New Buffalo: The Struggle for Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education in Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2006. Pp. 190.

Today, elders say that education, rather than the bison, needs to be relied upon for survival. (p. 2)

The plains “buffalo” is a North American icon, a symbol of the First Nations who inhabited the Great Plains and once depended on these huge mammals. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “buffalo” actually refers to several species of Old World oxen belonging to the genus *Bos* and only “in popular